

Appln. No. 10/664,280  
Response dated November 20, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of September 19, 2006  
Docket No. 6169-434

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

These remarks are submitted in response to the Office Action of September 19, 2006 (hereinafter Office Action). As this response has been timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. Nonetheless, the Examiner is expressly authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0951.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,662,178 to Lee (hereinafter Lee). Claims 1, 6-8, 13, 14, and 16-18 additionally were objected to because of the informality noted at page 2 of the Office Action.

As an initial matter, Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the thorough and articulate reply to Applicants' previously submitted arguments. The Examiner's analysis has guided Applicants in making the claim amendments presented herein.

Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 8, and 16 to further emphasize certain aspects of the invention. Applicants also have amended Claims 1, 6-8, 13, 14, and 16-18 to correct the informality noted by the Examiner. The claim amendments, as discussed herein, are fully supported throughout the Specification. The amendments do not introduce new matter.

### **Aspects of the Invention**

At this juncture, it may be helpful to reiterate certain aspects of Applicants' invention. One embodiment of the invention, exemplified by Claim 1, as amended, is a method of arranging grammar files in a presentation list.

The method can include receiving a system request to visually display the grammar files in a presentation list presented with a graphical user interface. The method also can include sorting the grammar files based on a first criterion that assigns user-defined grammar files priority over built-in grammar files. The method further can

include sorting the grammar files according to a second criterion, and simultaneously displaying user-defined grammar files and the built-in grammar files within the presentation list.

Moreover, according to the method, the files can be visually presented so that each user-defined grammar file is visually distinguishable from each built-in grammar file when both types of files are visually presented simultaneously. (See, e.g., Specification, paragraph [0016], describing the simultaneous display of both user-defined and built-in grammars in a single presentation list, with the former being presented higher in the list above the latter; see also paragraph [0017], describing the simultaneous presentation of user-defined and built-in grammars partitioned into distinct subsets and simultaneously presented.)

#### **The Claims Define Over Lee**

Independent Claims 1, 8, and 16 were, as already noted, rejected as being anticipated by Lee. Lee is directed to an apparatus and method for searching and organizing intellectual property documents. (See, e.g., Col. 1, lines 50-55; see also Abstract.)

It is stated at page 3 of the Office Action that Lee's searching in response to a search query is equivalent to a system request to display a grammar file as provided by Applicants' invention. It is further stated that because Lee displays files that correspond to the search query, but does not display files that do not match the query, this is equivalent to displaying user-defined grammar files that are visually distinguishable from built-in grammar files:

The built-in files are the files in a database that are not displayed because they do not match the query. Because the user-defined files are displayed

as results, they are visually distinguishable from the built-files. (Office Action, p. 3.)

This is different than Applicants' invention, however. Specifically, as expressly recited in Claims 1, 8, and 16, as amended, Applicants' invention *simultaneously* displays in a graphical user interface both user-defined *and* built-in grammar files.

One aspect of Applicants' invention is that it addresses a problem, noted by Applicants and described in the Specification, that arises when a user is working with two distinct types of grammar files and needs to be able to distinguish between the two types. For example, in the context of a callflow designer working with lists of grammar files in a graphical callflow builder, the designer able to select more rapidly and more accurately user-defined grammar files that are visually distinct from built-in grammar files:

Embodiments in accordance with the invention can provide a solution for optimally arranging grammar files in a presentation list where each file name in the list is sorted first based on whether the file is created by the user or is system or built-in, then on a secondary attribute such as position in an alphabetical list. Using this list strategy for grammar files, a callflow designer will be able to select grammar files faster, and with better accuracy. (Specification, paragraph [0011].)

Thus, with Applicants' invention, both user-defined and built-in grammar files are sorted so as to give priority to the former over the latter. Both the user-defined and the built-in grammar files are then simultaneously displayed in a presentation list, as expressly recited in amended Claims 1, 8, and 16. Although both the user-defined and built-in grammar files are simultaneously displayed, they are displayed so that each user-

Appln. No. 10/664,280  
Response dated November 20, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of September 19, 2006  
Docket No. 6169-434

defined grammar file is visually distinguishable from each built-in grammar file, as further recited in amended Claims 1, 8, and 16.

Accordingly, Lee fails to teach, expressly or inherently, every feature recited in amended Claims 1, 8, and 16. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that Claims 1, 8, and 16 define over the prior art. Applicants further respectfully submit that whereas each of the remaining claims depends from one of Claims 1, 8, and 16 while reciting additional features, the dependent claims likewise define over the prior art.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 20, 2006



\_\_\_\_\_  
Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577  
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,562  
AKERMAN SENTERFITT  
Customer No. 40987  
Post Office Box 3188  
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188  
Telephone: (561) 653-5000